

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 112 OF 2005
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1061 OF 2005

MRS. MANJUSHREE JAIN PETITIONER.
VS.
UNION OF INDIA & ORS. RESPONDENTS.

Mr. C.M. Jha for the petitioner.
Mr. T.J. Pandian for the respondents.

CORAM : S.K.SHAH, J.
DATE : 13TH JANUARY, 2006

P.C.

1. The order of which the contempt is alleged to have been committed was passed in writ petition, on 18th April, 2005.

2. The grievance made by the petitioner is that the concerned authority, namely, the Additional Chief Security Commissioner did not appoint committee to look into the complaint made by the petitioner, particularly, with regard to question of harassment.

2. The said order runs as follows :-

"Appeal lies to the Additional Chief Security Commissioner. It will be open to the petitioner to raise question of harassment before this officer in case the same has not been raised so far. We expect the officer to look into the complaint in all seriousness and if required constitute a committee to look into the complaint. The order passed by the Appellate Officer can be subsequently raised to the

Administrative Tribunal."

3. The learned Counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner was allowed to raise question of harassment before the appellate authority. The order of the appellate authority which was mainly concerning the termination of the petitioner was challenged before the CAT, Bombay. It is still pending.

4. The learned Counsel further submits that the Railway Board had appointed a committee for going into the allegations with regard to harassment and committee has taken a decision.

5. Under these circumstances, there is no question of contempt having been committed. Petition is therefore disposed of.

[S.K. SHAH, J.]